

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/718,181	10/718,181 11/20/2003		Evran Y. Ener	S51.12-0049	9322	
164	7590	05/19/2006		EXAMINER		
KINNEY &		•	SPISICH, GEORGE D			
312 SOUTH		NGE BUILDING STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MINNEAPO	OLIS, MI	N 55415-1002	3616			
				DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)					
	Office Action Comments	10/718,1	10/718,181 ENER ET AL.						
	Office Action Summary	Examine	•	Art Unit					
		George D	•	3616					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress				
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INTERPRETATION OF THE MAILING INTERPRETATION OF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THE FR 1.136(a). In no even on. period will apply and we statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tin ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	21 February 20	06						
	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
3)	, -								
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims				•				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application	ation							
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>13-17</u> is/are allowed.								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) <u>1 and 7</u> is/are rejected.								
·	•								
8)[•								
Applicat	ion Papers								
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Exa	ıminer							
,	The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 February 2006</u>		cepted or b)□ objecte	d to by the Exami	iner.				
,_	Applicant may not request that any objection t	•	, , , , , ,	•					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	=	-	, ,	FR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	he Examiner. N	ote the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)□	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reian priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).					
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	, o.g., p., o., j.		(-) (-).					
ŕ	1. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have bee	n received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu			on No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority docum	ents have been receive	ed in this National	Stage				
	application from the International B	ureau (PCT Ru	e 17.2(a)).		•				
* (See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the cert	fied copies not receive	ed.					
Attachmen	nt(s)								
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94		Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate					
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S er No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PT	O-152) `				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art in Figure 1 in view of Smith et al. (USPN 6,189,901).

Applicant's Prior Art in Figure 1 shows a concrete pumping truck having frame rails, a hopper carried at the rear end of the truck and an outrigger system. However, Figure 1 does not show an auxiliary axle system pivotally mounted at the rear of the truck. It is well known in the art to mount an auxiliary axle system at the rear of a work vehicle that typically hauls heavy loads. These axle systems are pivoted with respect to the frame to contact the ground when needed and raised when not needed. These auxiliary axles help to distribute the weight of the vehicle and it's load and improve the security of the vehicle by increasing the contact between the wheels and the ground for added traction and stability.

Smith et al. shows an auxiliary axle system having a pair of steerable wheels including means connected to a support structure of the vehicle for moving the auxiliary

Art Unit: 3616

axle between a lowered first position in contact with a ground surface and a second raised position elevated above the ground surface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the auxiliary axle system as taught by Smith et al. on the rear of the Prior Art Figure 1 as it is well known in the art to add an auxiliary axle to help distribute the load and increase traction and stability.

It is within the ordinary scope of one skilled in the art to make minor adjustments in spacing and orientation to accommodate the auxiliary axle with respect to the hopper on the rear end of the concrete truck in Applicant's Prior Art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that due to the placement of the hopper in Applicant's Prior Art, it would not be possible to mount the auxiliary axle arrangement of Smith et al.

Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection. It is within the scope of one skilled in the art to make adjustments to spacing and orientation to provide an auxiliary axle on the concrete truck in Applicant's Prior Art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13-17 are allowed.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Moran (USPN 6,419,247), Christenson et al. (USPN 5,597,174), Barry (USPN 6,155,277), Brandi (USPN 4,311,396).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/718,181

Art Unit: 3616

81 Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George D. Spisich whose telephone number is (571) 272-6676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 to 6:30 except alt. Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on (571) 272-6669. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

George D. Spisich May 15, 2006

PAUL N. DICKSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

5/15/06